

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on April 13, 2009. Claims 1-36 are pending. Claims 1-36 represent method and system for providing enhancement performance of web browsing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 10-16, 18, 20-24, and 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta U.S. 7,000,189 in view of Sharma U.S. 20030125953.

Dutta teaches the invention substantially as claimed including dynamic data generation suitable for talking browser (see abstract).

As to claims 1, 10, 19, 26, 32 and 36, Dutta teaches a method, a network apparatus, a method, a system and a network device for retrieving content over a

communication network from a web server, the method comprising:

receiving a request from a browser application for the content in the web server (column 6, lines 1-4; column 9, line 21);

modifying the request to include information specifying support as to permit handling of the modified request by the web server in absence of an upstream proxy that is communicating with the web server (column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 1);

forwarding the modified request towards the web server, wherein the upstream proxy, if present, intercepts the modified (column 9, line 22); and

selectively receiving the content from the upstream proxy over the communication network and forwarding the content to the browser application (column 9, lines 22-25).

Dutta fails to teach explicitly a parse and pre-fetch service, and pre-fetched the content from the web server.

However, Sharma teaches information retrieval system including voice browser and data conversion server. Sharma teaches a parse and pre-fetch service (paragraph [0031], Sharma discloses retrieving a content and parsing it by a parser; figure 3, items 340 and 324), and pre-fetched the content from the web server (paragraph [0049], Sharma discloses prefetching content from pages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dutta in view of Sharma to provide a parse and pre-fetch service, and pre-fetched the content from the web server for the purpose of minimizing the delay exhibited by the system (paragraph [0049]).

As to claims 2, 11, 20, 27 and 33, Dutta teaches a method, a network apparatus and a system according to claims 1, 10, 19, 26 and 32, wherein the upstream proxy in the modifying step retrieves an initial content from the web server, and parses the retrieved initial content, the pre-fetched content being based on the parsed initial content (column 8, lines 20-25).

As to claims 3, 12, 21 and 28, Dutta teaches a method, a network apparatus and a system according to claims 1, 10, 19 and 26 wherein the request in the modifying step conforms with a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP), the method further comprising: inserting the treatment information in an optional field of the HTTP (column 5, lines 44-48).

As to claims 4, 13, 22 and 29, Dutta teaches a method, a network apparatus and a system according to claims 1, 10, 19 and 26, wherein the step of modifying the request is transparent to the browser application (column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 4).

As to claim 5, Dutta teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising: receiving another request from another browser application (column 6, lines 1-4; column 9, line 21); and
forwarding another modified request based on the other request to another upstream proxy, wherein said receiving and forwarding steps are concurrently executed

with the steps of receiving the request and modifying the request (column 9, lines 22-25).

As to claims 6, 15 and 35, Dutta teaches a method, a network apparatus and a system according to claims 1, 10 and 32, further comprising:

communicating with a switching module to receive the request, wherein the switching module including Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) Layer 4 functionality to redirect the request from a network interface (column 5, lines 31-35).

As to claims 7, 16, 23 and 30, Dutta teaches a method and a network apparatus according to claims 1, 10, 19 and 26, wherein the content conforms with a markup language that includes Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) (column 4, lines 43-47).

As to claim 14, Dutta teaches a network apparatus according to claim 10, wherein the proxy concurrently communicates with a plurality of upstream proxies including the remote upstream proxy (column 2, lines 57-63).

As to claim 18, Dutta teaches a network apparatus according to claim 10, further comprising:

a local upstream proxy configured to support pre-fetching of content from another web server local to the network apparatus (column 3, lines 17-22).

As to claim 34, Dutta teaches a system according to claim 32, further comprising:

a plurality of upstream proxies in simultaneous communication with the downstream proxy of the first server for supporting parsing and pre-fetching of content from a respective plurality of web servers (column 2, lines 57-63).

Claims 9 and 25 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-7, 10-16, 18, 20-24, and 27-36 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

4. Claims 8, 17, 24 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta U.S. 7,000,189 in view Sharma U.S. 20030125953, further in view of Chatterjee et al. U.S. 6,947,440.

Dutta teaches the invention substantially as claimed including dynamic data generation suitable for talking browser (see abstract).

As to claims 8, 17, 24 and 31, Dutta teaches a method according to claims 1, 10, 19 and 26.

Dutta fails to teach explicitly the communication network includes a Very Small Aperture Terminal (VSAT) satellite network, and the upstream proxy in the modifying step resides in a VSAT in communication with the web server.

However, Chatterjee teaches system and method for Internet page acceleration including multicast transmission. Chatterjee teaches the communication network includes a Very Small Aperture Terminal (VSAT) satellite network, and the upstream

proxy in the modifying step resides in a VSAT in communication with the web server (column 14, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dutta in view of Chatterjee to provide the communication network includes a Very Small Aperture Terminal (VSAT) satellite network, and the upstream proxy in the modifying step resides in an VSAT in communication with the web server, One would be motivated to do so to allow handling the wireless link 181 with a T1 data rate.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on April 13, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicant argues that the Examiner acknowledges that Dutta et al. fails to disclose the claimed features of "modifying the request to include information specifying support of a parse and pre-fetch service as to permit handling of the modified request by the web server in absence of an upstream proxy that is communicating with the web server" and "forwarding the modified request towards the web server, wherein the upstream proxy, if present, intercepts the modified request and pre-fetched the content from the web server." The Examiner relies on Sharma to provide for the deficiencies of Dutta et al..

In regards to point (A), Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner never acknowledged that Dutta fails to teach such argued feature as described by Applicant.

(B) Applicant argues that Dutta does not disclose modifying the request for content.

In regards to point (B), Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 1, Dutta discloses modifying the content of the response upon detecting a request from a talking browser. This request from a talking browser is inherently a “modified request” in that it is not a regular request. This type of request is causing the web server to modify the content of the response to exclude content not suitable for presentation to a talking browser.

(C) Applicant argues that the combination of Dutta and Sharma still does not result in the claimed feature of "modifying the request [for content] to include information specifying support of a parse and pre-fetch service as to permit handling of the modified request by the web server in absence of an upstream proxy that is communicating with the web server."

In regards to point (C), Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, one would be motivated to do so for the purpose of minimizing the delay exhibited by the system (paragraph [0049]).

(D) Applicant argues that there is no suggestion in Sharma that the pre-fetching is performed as a result of modifying the request for content to include information specifying support of a parse and pre-fetch service. Accordingly, there would have been nothing to lead the artisan to modify the request for content in Durra et al. to include information specifying support of a parse and pre-fetch service.

In regards to point (D), Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, one would be motivated to do so for the purpose of minimizing the delay exhibited by the system in responding to subsequent user requests for content once a dialogue has been initiated

(paragraph [0049]). Therefore, the combination of Sharma in view of Dutta would lead an artisan to modify the request to include information specifying support of a parse and pre-fetch service.

(E) Applicant argues that the Examiner rationale does not even address this feature of “identifying the downstream proxy”.

In regards to point (E), Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In the abstract, Dutta discloses providing or transferring information to the client device by the server (i.e. “identifying the downstream proxy”) in response to the client request.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to El Hadji M Sall whose telephone number is 571-272-4010. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/El Hadji M Sall/

Examiner, Art Unit 2457

/Salad Abdullahi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457